REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. In the office action mailed December 12, 2006, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 5,966,714 to Huang (Huang). Claim 5 was also objected to because of a typographical error.

Claim 5 has been amended to correct the typographical error objected to by the Examiner. The objection to claim 5 is therefore believed overcome.

As for the substantive rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejections because the pending claims include at least one limitation/feature that *Huang* does not disclose. As set forth below, *Huang* actually disparages and teaches away from the apparatus and method of the pending claims.

Referring to claim 1, the claim's preamble clearly recites that the claim is directed to an apparatus that facilitates the placement of data into a form that will facilitate its efficient communication. The claim's first limitation is a "change list." The change list is recited as including a *history* of changes made to one of the databases.

The preamble of independent claim 18 recites that claim 18 is directed to a method of facilitating placement into a form to facilitate its efficient communication. Claim 18 recites that a *history* of database changes is placed into a change list.

Both of the independent claims of this application clearly and plainly recite that a history of database changes is made part of, or included in, a change list. As described in the specification, the change list is transmitted to effectuate a database update.

A careful review of *Huang* reveals that it is replete with descriptions of how a record changed in one database, is sent in its entirety over to another database. In column 10, lines 52-

7

56, FIG. 4b of *Huang* is described as being an "exemplary change list." In column 12, line33

describes FIG. 4b as illustrating an "exemplary change list." An inspection of FIG. 4b shows

that it contains a complete record of e-mail addresses.

Nowhere does *Huang* teach or suggest keeping a history of database changes. In column

15, lines 18-24, *Huang* succinctly describes his invention as *not* including a history of database

changes:

> "[T]he synchronization method of this invention is *only* concerned with the end
> resulting difference between [mail box databases] rather than the history of all
> changes that might have happened, a synchronization aware application (such as
> App1 in FIG. 5f) need not keep a traditional log of all activities for each record.
> Instead, it is safe to truncate the log such that *only* the most recent relevant
> changes are kept." (Emphasis added.)

(See *Huang*, column 15, lines 18-24.)

The text of *Huang* could not be clearer. *Huang* is unconcerned with and in fact, teaches

away from keeping a history of database changes as pending claims 1 and 18 both require.

Claims 1 and 18 are therefore not anticipated by *Huang*.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's misapplication of *Huang*, the independent claims have

been amended to more clearly delineate the claimed subject matter and to further distinguish the

pending claims from *Huang*. Paraphrased, both independent claims have been amended to recite

that the change list includes a tag length indicator, which indicates the change entry's length. As

set forth in the specification, the tag length indicator specifies the length of a change entry to a

database and its inclusion obviates the need for null terminators and minimizes the time required

to effectuate a database update. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 18 is found in

paragraph [0042] of the published specification. No new matter has been added.

The claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) are believed to be traversed for the reasons set forth above. In addition to requiring a history of database changes to be included in a change list, the pending claims now recite a tag length indicator that identifies the length of a change list entry being sent. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Robert H. Kelly /

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com